IN THE HIGH COURT OF BOMBAY AT GOA

CRIMINAL MISC. APPLICATION NO. 285 OF 2006

IN

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 13 OF 2006

MRS. LINDA FERNANDES ....Applicant

Versus

MRS. ELVIRA DIAS AND ORS., ...Respondents

Applicant in Person.
Mr. P. A. Kamat, Advocate for the Original Petitioners.
Ms. W. Coutinho, Public Prosecutor for the Respondent Nos.1 and 2.

Coram:- N. A. BRITTO, J.

Date:- 16th August, 2006

P.C.:-

Heard the applicant/respondent no.3 in person and Mr. P. A. Kamat, the learned Counsel on behalf of the respondents/petitioners. Mr. Kamat has submitted that what is described by the applicant/respondent no.3 in para 1, clauses (iii) and (iv) are clerical mistakes and therefore they could be corrected. In the light of the said submission necessary corrections of the said clerical mistakes be carried out in the Order of this Court dated 12-7-2006. The applicant/respondent no.3 also submits that she has always been ready to submit the original Sale Deed and therefore the first two lines in para 5 at page 7 of the Order of this Court dated 12-7-2006 also requires to be corrected but, this is objected to by learned Counsel Mr. Kamat. In case the applicant/respondent no.3 is now willing to submit the original of the Sale Deed by which her father-in-law had purchased a portion of the property, she is always free to do so. The said observation in para 5 cannot be considered as a clerical mistake and therefore requires no interference.

With the above observations the application is disposed of. The so-called omissions as set out in para 2 of the application cannot be corrected in the light of Section 362 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973.

N. A. BRITTO, J.

RD.